

However, if it were to fail for an extended period, it would create a cascading problem for the economy and national security, because iron ore that goes through the locks would have no way to get from Lake Superior to factories across the country.

Also, this is an issue that Democrats, Republicans, and President Trump all agree on.

When President Trump came to Michigan last year, I was joined by Congressman BERGMAN and Congressman MITCHELL. We told the President about the Soo Locks, and he pledged his support. That was backed up in March when the Army Corps of Engineers requested \$75.3 million in its budget for next year.

I appreciate and want to thank President Trump for his leadership on this. That request is funded in legislation now, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to keep this construction moving forward in the years to come.

□ 1800

CELEBRATING ANNIVERSARY OF 19TH AMENDMENT

(Mrs. TRAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the passage of the 19th Amendment 100 years ago today.

It is remarkable to imagine that the fundamental right to vote was only granted to women this recently. If only the suffragettes who sacrificed so much for so long could see the results of their movement, that I would be serving in Congress shoulder to shoulder with 131 women, the most in our Nation's history.

We know that better decisions are made when more women are at the table, from the boardroom to the floor of this historic Chamber.

Women have been blazing the path of social progress in the United States for centuries, marching for civil rights, striking for workers' rights, organizing against gun violence, and speaking out on sexual harassment. Today, we continue to reshape our country, writing new history in the Halls of Congress.

We stand on the shoulders of those who came before us, women like Susan B. Anthony, Shirley Chisholm, Edith Nourse Rogers, and many more, and make sure we do our part to pave the new path for women to follow after us.

Madam Speaker, I am proud and honored to take part in celebrating the anniversary of the 19th Amendment.

CELEBRATING PATRIOTISM OF AMERICAN WOMEN EARNING RIGHT TO VOTE

(Mr. PALMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, almost from the day that I have been elected to Congress, I have looked forward to the opportunity to honor my wife's great-grandmother.

She was able to vote in the 1920 election. Prior to that election, in Boston, they distributed sample ballots. This document that I have with me today has been in my wife's family for almost 100 years. On the back of the document, Miss Abby Mayhew Cushing wrote this note: "November 2, 1920. Cast my first vote for President of these United States."

You can feel the pride and the patriotism in those words that she experienced for the first time. Abby Mayhew Cushing was 67 years old.

With all due respect to my Democrat colleagues, she wrote: "Voted straight Republican ticket. Smashing victory for Harding and Coolidge." Then she added this: "President Harding died very suddenly August 2, 1923, in California. Burial in Marion, Ohio, Friday, August 10."

This is, for the Cushing family, a historic document that celebrates the patriotism of American women earning the right to vote.

NO ONE IS ABOVE THE LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise, and I do so with the love of my country within my heart, and I do so this evening because I believe that no one is above the law. No one.

We find this to be the case in our great country: If you are a person who exceeds the speed limit, you are breaking the law. If you are caught exceeding the speed limit, there is a price to pay. No one is above the law.

If you are a person who happens to, in the State of Texas, decide that you are going to go through the supermarket and pick and choose certain things that you would like to sample, at some point, if you partake of more than is reasonable, you will be charged with grazing. It is a crime in the State of Texas to graze, to take more than what is reasonable in having a sample of a grape. No one is above the law. People are prosecuted in the State of Texas for grazing.

In the State of Texas, a good many persons have been prosecuted for not causing their children to go to school. Thwarting public attendance in school was a law in the State of Texas. People paid fines for not having their children in school.

The list of laws is too long to ever mention in a statement such as this, but the point is, no one is above the law. There are laws that deal with persons who commit felonies and persons who commit misdemeanors. When you break these laws, you are prosecuted.

You are not allowed to break the law with impunity, and you are not allowed to do it with immunity. No one is above the law.

I believe that this is a part of the very hallmark of our criminal justice system in this great country. We believe that no one is above the law and that no one is beneath the law, meaning that the law should apply equally to all. Every person ought to be treated the same when it comes to the very bedrock principle of whether or not someone is above the law. No one is in this country.

However, we find ourselves with a unique circumstance now. We have the highest office holder in the executive branch, the chief executive officer, if you will, who has refused to cooperate with lawful investigations of the Congress.

He refused to cooperate in this sense. He has said to witnesses they should not appear and give testimony in a lawful investigation. He indicated that subpoenas will not be answered. They were issued pursuant to lawful investigations.

No one is above the law. If you are not above the law, then if you are called upon to testify, you must testify. If you have some document within your possession and there has been a request for it by way of a subpoena, then you have to produce it. No one is above the law.

Well, we currently have a circumstance where the chief executive officer is at odds with the legislative branch. This places the legislative and the executive at odds with each other. They are in a stalemate, if you will.

When this occurs, you have one branch of government refusing to cooperate with lawful requests of another branch, the executive refusing the request of the legislative, then you have a standoff, as I indicated. No one is above the law.

This, in my opinion, creates a constitutional crisis. Now, there are people who would differ with me. But remember this: What they are expressing is what I am expressing, an opinion. This is my opinion. They have their opinion. There is no hard and fast definition for a constitutional crisis.

There are some who would contend that to have a constitutional crisis in this area, the subpoenas that have been issued would have to go to court. They would have to be litigated. At some point, a court might say to the executive branch of the government that it must obey the subpoena issued by Congress, the lawful subpoena.

If the executive officer declines to obey the subpoena, it would be concluded that you have a constitutional crisis because the chief executive officer is not only disobeying Congress, he is disobeying a third branch of the government, the judicial branch, the judiciary. So you would then have a constitutional crisis.

I differ. It is my opinion that you have a constitutional crisis when the

chief executive officer declines and refuses to obey a lawful request from the legislative branch. I think that when you get to the point that the President of the United States, or the chief executive officer, refuses an order from the court, you have a constitutional crisis, but you also have a collapse.

That is when you have gone beyond a constitutional crisis. It is a collapse. The crisis leads up to that point. Once this happens and the President refuses to obey the judiciary as well as the legislative, you have a collapse.

Right now, we are in a constitutional crisis. In this constitutional crisis, we have a circumstance that has developed that we cannot tolerate. You see, it is the legislative branch that has the duty to provide the check on the executive branch such that we maintain the balance of power. When the legislative branch seeks to check the executive branch and it absolutely refuses to cooperate, when this occurs, the system of checks and balances is being ignored.

The system of checks and balances was put in place by the Framers of the Constitution to prevent the concentration of power in any one branch of government. To prevent the executive branch from having a concentration of power, the legislative branch was given this ability to check it.

When the legislative branch cannot get cooperation, the ultimate check that it has is impeachment. The legislative branch prevents the concentration of power by saying to the chief executive officer: Mr. Chief Executive Officer, you are out of balance. You are assuming more authority than the Constitution accords you. Because you cannot do this, we, the Members of the legislative branch, can bring you before the bar of justice. We can call on you to answer for your failure to honor lawful investigative requests of the legislative branch. So we bring you before the bar of justice, and that is called impeachment.

But it is important to remember that the Framers of the Constitution put the system of checks and balances in place to prevent a concentration of power. Why would we want to prevent a concentration of power? Because if the chief executive officer, the President, is allowed to have power concentrated beyond what the Constitution accords, meaning there are no guardrails, the President can do whatever he chooses.

The President then becomes an officer who is and can be above the law. He is above the law in this country. No person is above the law. The checks and balances are in place to prevent the President from being above the law.

If we don't enforce this system of checks and balances, we then allow the concentration of power, and we no longer have the form of government that the Framers intended and that we have enjoyed for these many years.

We would have a monarchy. We would have a monarchy. A monarch has

the power to do whatever he chooses. The monarch is the law.

We never intended in this country for the chief executive officer, the President, to be the law. We intended for the President to enforce the law by and through the various agencies that are under his domain, if you will, but not to be the law itself, not to decide what the law is on any given day, not to decide that he will obey the law when he chooses. No one is above the law.

The Mueller report is a good indication of how the law is viewed. The Mueller report indicates that there are many instances where, but for a rule that the Justice Department adheres to, the President would be indicted—but for this rule.

You won't find the words stated exactly as I have stated them, but that is the essence of what is stated in the Mueller report as it relates to obstruction of justice. Mr. Mueller was assigned the responsibility of looking into certain aspects of the campaign that the President participated in before being elected and to ascertain whether or not there was some collusion, obstruction of justice, if you will.

□ 1815

The Mueller conclusion is that the President is not exonerated when it comes to obstruction of justice and that the President but for these rules that they have, this rule that says you don't indict a sitting President, the President would likely be indicted. I say, likely be, because Mr. Mueller didn't say he would be, but he did say that the President wasn't exonerated when it comes to obstruction of justice.

So the President is not above the law, and if the Justice Department is not going to prosecute, then where is the bar of justice?

It is here. It is right here in this room; this very august body that we call the Congress of the United States of America. We then have the responsibility. If the Justice Department is not going to pursue the President, then it is left to the Congress. This is the last alternative for ensuring that the checks and balances are maintained and that the President is not above the law.

Who agrees with the Mueller Report as I have expressed it?

Some 800 former prosecutors have indicated that if this were any other person who violated the law as they see it in the Mueller Report, that this person would be prosecuted. They go on to say that it is critical that obstruction of justice be prosecuted because if you do not, then what you are sending is a message to people that they can interfere with lawful investigations. They don't say it in those exact words, but that is the import of the message that they do share with us, some 800 prosecutors, Federal prosecutors, persons who understand this law.

Many of them have said that there is more than enough evidence here to

prosecute anyone other than the President. But they have been respectful, and they understand that there is a rule in the Justice Department—the Office of Legal Counsel has promulgated it—that indicates that a sitting President won't be prosecuted.

If the sitting President is not going to be prosecuted, then these 800 lawyers are saying to us that the bar of justice has to be the place where the President will be brought, and that bar of justice is here in the House of Representatives. No one is above the law.

We now recognize that we are some 34 days since the Mueller Report was made public. This is the number of days that the Trump administration has been above the law, some 34 days.

Why?

Because we have one official in the administration who has refused to honor a lawful request by the Ways and Means Committee to produce certain records, certain records belonging to the President, tax records—refused to produce those records in contravention of the law. Another official, the person who heads the Justice Department, is declining to respond to requests of the Judiciary Committee.

No one is above the law. So we now have not only the President refusing, but the persons who are part of the administration are refusing. Some 34 days now I would say the administration itself has been above the law.

These are the days since the Mueller Report has been released to the public, the number of days the Trump administration has been above the law.

I love my country. I never came to Congress to give the speech I am giving tonight. I didn't come to Congress to take on the most powerful person on the planet Earth. I find myself standing here because I believe that you cannot see that this moral imperative exists to make sure that the law is followed and treated the same as it relates to all people and then ignore it. I just don't see how you can do it. I cannot. I refuse to ignore the fact that the President has obstructed justice.

The President is not above the law. No one is. I will not allow political expediency, this notion that rather than deal with this now, let's just wait and let the next election determine the fate of a person who has breached the law in the highest office of the land, I might add. I refuse to accept it. I just cannot.

The President is not above the law. I didn't come to the Congress to say this, but I love my country, and I see what this is doing to the country, when we have the chief executive officer saying to law enforcement officers—and he did say what I am about to tell you—that you don't have to be nice when you arrest people.

What message are you sending to them in terms of what their behavior should be when they take people into their care, custody, and control?

You are saying to them you can break the law.

What kind of message do you send when you are at a campaign rally and

you say to people: Don't worry about how you treat them; if they arrest you, I will take care of it?

That wasn't the exact language, but that was the message. This is the chief executive officer. This is the person who is the standard-bearer for the United States of America—the standard-bearer, the person who carries the torch of freedom for the United States of America.

What are you saying when you say that you are a person who would support the breaking of the law and then you would support defending the person who breaks the law?

You are saying you are above the law and you believe it, and you are saying you are willing to take care of those who would break the law as well.

We have seen circumstances in this country that I never thought we would see: a President sending messages and signals indicating that if you side with me, I have the magic wand. If you side with me, I have the power to erase your offenses, your crimes. It is not really erasing, but I am communicating that it is a pardon. The President has this power, and he sends signals: break the law, but worry not, I have your back.

Is this what we expect from the highest office in the land in the greatest country in the world?

Are we going to allow ourselves to be brought into this complicity that we see so many people succumbing to?

I don't think so. I will not. We cannot allow ourselves to become complicit. We cannot allow ourselves to become a party to what is going on here. The mere fact that we stand silent on it, as Dr. King put it: at some point, silence in and of itself becomes betrayal.

The silence is betraying our country, it is betraying the Constitution, and it is betraying the Republic. The silence—no one is above the law.

When will we cease to be silent on the greatest issue confronting us at this time?

The Republic is at stake. It is not about Republicans, it is about the Republic and whether we will maintain it. It is not about Democrats, it is about our democracy. This is bigger than all of us. It is bigger. It is bigger than the President. It is about the country we love and whether we are going to allow one person to destroy the concept of no one being above the law.

It is bigger than we are, and the truth is it has now become an issue that is about Congress. This issue is now about Congress. It is about whether the Congress of the United States of America is going to fulfill its responsibility. It is about whether the Congress of the United States of America will see and say—see that the President is obstructing and say that the President is obstructing.

I marvel at the number of Members of Congress who have said that the President is obstructing justice, who have said that the President has com-

mitted impeachable offenses, impeachable acts, but notwithstanding having said it will not say that the President ought to be impeached. There are some who say that he should be impeached as a matter of fact and still won't move to impeach him.

The President is not above the law. We are the law, the Members of Congress, 435 of us. We have been given an awesome responsibility. It is awesome. I don't take it lightly. It is not something that I think everybody should have the responsibility accorded to them because there are a good many people who don't believe that you should prosecute a President. They think that if the President commits a crime, well, that is the President. I am not one of them.

They think that you have to commit a crime, by the way, before you can be impeached, a good many people. I am not one of them. The President doesn't have to commit a crime to be impeached. It is the harm that he causes society that the Framers of the Constitution addressed in Federalist 65, the words of Madison, Jay, and Hamilton.

The President is not above the law. We in this body are now the issue. The issue is: Will Congress do what the Constitution has given us as the means by which we can deal with a chief executive officer who is breaking the law, who sees himself, apparently by virtue of his behavior, as being above the law?

This is what Congress has to look into. This is what Congress has to bring before the bar of justice, this whole notion that the President is not above the law.

So let's just take a moment now and talk about the process of impeachment because a good many people don't understand. Impeachment does not mean that a President is removed from office. Impeachment is sort of like an indictment. It is not the same but very much similar to an indictment. The Members of the House of Representatives serve as a body very similar to a grand jury. It is not the same, but it is similar to a grand jury. The Members of the House of Representatives determine whether or not a President should be impeached. They do so with a vote, a majority of the House voting to impeach, and the President is impeached.

The President doesn't have to commit a crime to be impeached. Andrew Johnson was impeached in 1868. Article 10 of the articles of impeachment against him for a high misdemeanor that was not a crime—a misdemeanor is a misdeed, aside from being a minor criminal offense it is also a misdeed. He was impeached for this misdeed, and we here in this body can impeach any President for misdeeds.

So if the body impeaches, it doesn't mean that the President is removed from office. It simply means that the President must now go to trial in the Senate. There is no requirement in the Constitution for the House to have to investigate the Mueller Report. The

Mueller Report has been shared with us. There is enough evidence in that report to impeach the President. The Mueller Report has evidence shared by virtue of talking to witnesses who gave their testimony under the penalty of perjury. We can use that as the reason—that report—to send this to the Senate where a trial will take place.

Remember, impeachment is sort of like an indictment—not the same but similar. It goes to the Senate. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court would preside over that trial—the Chief Justice.

In so doing, the House will have persons called managers. These managers would act as prosecutors. They would bring evidence before the Senate for the Senate to act upon. The Senate acts upon the evidence. The Chief Justice is there to make sure certain rules are followed. For example, if the House prosecutors, the managers, if they would like to call a witness, the Chief Justice will then be there to assist the process to get that witness before the Senate.

There is a trial. Witnesses are called. Subpoenas can be issued, and you don't have to meander through some lower courts, inferior courts, because all courts, when it comes to the impeachment of the President, are inferior to the Senate when it sits in trial of the President.

□ 1830

They are all inferior, all of the courts.

So you have the Chief Justice there to make his ruling. All of this is done before the public. There will be a trial. All of these subpoenas that are not being honored, all of the witnesses that are refusing to testify, take them before the Senate. Call them; have them sworn; have them give their testimony; and let the world hear and see.

There is a desire to have a trial before the trial in the House, to have a trial in the sense that witnesses come and appear and are a part of an investigation. That is not, in fact, the kind of trial that you think of when you think of the word "trial," but in a sense, we are having the witnesses come in and give their testimony. There is a desire to do this.

To be very honest with you, I am not antithetical to the idea, but I do understand that, if the witnesses are not coming, if the subpoenas are not being honored, then the option left to us is to impeach and have that trial in the Senate, where they will have to come. Subpoenas will have to be honored. That is the means by which we maintain the system of checks and balances when the President refuses to perform as expected under the Constitution—as a matter of fact, as required under the Constitution.

So, given that the President is not following the norms and not following the law and eventually we could take this through the inferior courts—they are inferior to the Senate when it sits

in trial of the President, because that is the ultimate court related to issues related to the President.

These things can meander through the inferior courts. They are not inferior in the sense that they are less than efficient and effective at what they do; they are just inferior to this impeachment trial when the President has been impeached, the trial to determine whether or not he should be removed from office. Impeachment doesn't remove the President from office.

But these subpoenas and all of these issues can go through these courts. No one knows how long it will take, but everybody prognosticates, people who know and who are supposed to know, that it can take months. It can take months, which means that we will, at some point, engage in paralysis analysis.

Dr. King called it the paralysis of analysis, but analysis paralysis, meaning this: We will have done all that we can in these courts to try to bring the President to justice, get the witnesses necessary to bring the President to justice because he has committed these impeachable acts, and at some point, you will get so close to an election that someone will say: Well, let's not do this. Let's just wait until the next election.

We will have been paralyzed going through the courts such that we won't get to the issues in time, and, as a matter of fact, it could be after the next election before some of the courts will rule. We just don't know. But those who prognosticate say that it will be months.

One would think that maybe there can be an expedited process, but the courts will determine whether this will be the case.

So, when you have all of this and you are confronting all of these things, you have to ask yourself: Will the House of Representatives do its job?

And for those who are saying, well, you have to have bipartisan support, I would love to see bipartisan support, but there is no requirement for it in the Constitution.

As a matter of fact, Jay, Hamilton, Madison, they prognosticated that you would not have unanimity. You won't have the bipartisanship that you are looking for. They said it would be a time of strife. They indicated that people would separate along party lines.

Read Federalist 65, not a long read. Read it. You will see. They prognosticated that there would be divisions. So to say you have got to have the Republican Party on board before the Democratic Party can do its job is incorrect—not required.

And, by the way, history is not going to be kind. It is not going to be kind. History is not going to be kind to us. History is going to cause a lot of reputations to be soiled. Those who look through the vista of time are not going to side with us the way we have friendships and relationships siding with us now.

History is not going to be kind to Democrats or Republicans. History is going to present us as people who saw an injustice in the highest office of the land and refused to do our jobs.

It won't be kind to us. Reputations are going to be tarnished. People who will be saluted and proclaimed heroes today who were just waiting to do the right thing at the right time, history is not going to be kind to them. There are too many things on record that they have already said. And there are too many people who will go back through these records, videos of what they have said.

They can walk it back now, and they can have friendships now that will be of assistance to them, but history is not going to be kind to them.

But there is a means by which we can bring ourselves back in proper alignment with the Constitution. It is called impeachment. This is what we can do, and it is never too late to get on the right side of history.

There are many people in this House who are on the wrong side of history, wrong side of history. The right side of politics, as they see it. I would rather be on the right side of history and the wrong side of politics.

So these persons who are now on the wrong side of history, my hope is that they will do as I see many of my colleagues doing now, and they are coming forward and they are acknowledging that enough is enough. Impeachment is a solution that has to be pursued.

The question no longer is who is going to be the first to engage in this notion that we have to bring the President before the bar of justice in the House of Representatives. This is not the question.

The question now is who will be the last person to say we must do it, because there seems to be a momentum building. There seems to be a momentum building that is going to cause some people who would have made history to be made by history.

History can make people, and people can make history. There are some people who are going to be proclaimed by our contemporaries now as having made history, but the truth is that history will make them. History will make them do what they should do and should have done.

They are going to have to face history. Maybe not right away, but, I assure you, time always tells. The truth is known, and history always judges.

We are going to be judged, my friends. We all are. We are going to be judged. So why don't we just get on the right side of history now and salvage some of the reputation that we have?

They don't have to lose their entire reputation. They don't have to become adamant about this. They have made their point. Let it go. Get on the right side of history. We know where this is going. It is just a matter of time.

There will be additional votes on impeachment right here on this floor of

the House of Representatives. Be on the right side of history for our children, for our grandchildren, for our great-grandchildren, for unborn generations. Get on the right side of history.

Yes, history will have made them, but they will have made the right decision.

History makes people; people make history. Either way, be on the right side of history. Don't find yourself on the wrong side of history when you hold yourself out to be a person who adheres to moral authority, the moral imperative to do the right thing. Be on the right side of history.

I have heard people say that the soul of the country is at risk. I concur. But I also say this: Before the soul of the country goes, the soul of the House of Representatives will have gone, the soul of the House of Representatives, the very soul that we have in our hands, that has the moral authority, the moral imperative, to go forward and not allow political expediency to jeopardize our duty to do that which the Constitution affords us the opportunity to do if we have but only the will to do it.

This House is now on trial. The House of Representatives is on trial in the court of public opinion. Some would say: Well, the court is not unanimously opposed. Some 40-plus percent of persons say that impeachment is appropriate.

The public is here today and there tomorrow. The public has no duty to stay in one place all the time. We are looking at a snapshot in time, and the public opinion will change. It does.

When Nixon was first brought before the attention of the Senate, as they were investigating, public opinion was not such that it would call for his impeachment then. Public opinion changes.

I have a great example—unrelated to impeachment, but a great example.

I remember when we had to vote on what has been called the "bailout." I remember the calls to my office. People knew that we were about to, as they saw it, bail out the banks, and the calls were very strong.

People called in in large numbers, saying: Don't you vote to bail out those banks. Don't you do it. If you do it—there was at least one caller, probably more, who said—we will run you out of town.

Well, I remember standing in the back of the Chamber, and as I stood there, after having cast my vote against the bailout, I saw the votes go up and the stock market go down.

And having done what I thought was the appropriate thing pursuant to the requests of my constituents, I could not wait to hear what the response would be the next day.

The response the next day was: What is wrong with you? Don't you see what you have done to my 401(k)? What is wrong with you? We are going to run you out of town.

I learned a lesson about public opinion. Public opinion can be in one place today and in an entirely different place tomorrow.

We should do what we believe is the right thing based upon what our conscience dictates. That is what I do.

I assure you, this is a question of conscience for me, and I am going to follow my conscience, and I will have done the right thing.

Dr. King said there are times when you have to do that which is neither safe, nor politic, nor popular. You do it because it is right.

I am going to do the right thing because conscience dictates that this is the right thing to do.

Madam Speaker, 34 days the President, the administration, is above the law—34 days.

But there is one other thing. There are some things that are indelible, some things that you can't get out of your mind, some things that you just can't reconcile within yourself.

This baby—and we have all seen this picture, or a good many of us have—crying, being separated from a parent—babies—at the border. I don't know the people. I know that they are part of the same race that I am a part of, the human race. I know that I have a kinship and a relationship with them.

For our executive office to promulgate a policy, produce a policy that separates babies from their parents and not have a means by which they can be reunited is sinful.

Babies separated from their parents and no means of reuniting them in place at the time you make this separation?

□ 1845

This is indelible in my mind. There are many other things to think about, but this I think about a lot, how we have treated people who are coming to this country who mean us no harm but who are trying to escape harm's way. I cannot divorce myself from it.

I don't know them. I just know that they are human beings.

I know that there is a crisis at the border. I think we have to deal with it. I want to deal with the border crisis. But I don't think separating children from their parents, as we have done it, is a part of the solution.

I think that persons who would do this are victims. Those Border Patrol officers are victims themselves for what they have to do. Many of them, they don't want to do some of the things that they are being forced to do. They, too, are victims.

But it started at the top. It started at the top with a belief that somehow this would deter people from coming, people who are fleeing harm's way.

I only say to people as it relates to me. I say to myself, but for the grace of God, I could be one of these people. I was just fortunate enough to be born in this country, in a country where there are great opportunities. But for the grace of God, it could be me.

Why would I treat someone with this level of indignity? But for the grace of God, it could be me.

I refuse to let this go. I believe that this, too, is a part of the overall rationale for impeachment.

Madam Speaker, this is our watch. This is the watch that has been afforded us. To every woman and man, a watch is given, and this is our watch.

We can do as best we can to reconcile in our minds that this is okay, that it is all right. But in our hearts, we can't reconcile it. The mind can reconcile it, but the heart cannot.

My heart won't let this be reconciled. In my mind, it is indelible.

I say that, on my watch, I want the RECORD to show that I took a stand. Even when I had to stand alone, I took a stand. It is better to stand alone than not stand at all.

But there are others who are standing, and I believe there will be many more, one of whom happens to be on the opposite side of the aisle. I thank him for having courage.

I know what is going to happen. He is going to be ridiculed, but don't let that become the final word. When the pages of history are properly written, he will be vindicated. He will be vindicated. I assure him, my dear brother, he will be vindicated.

I don't know him. I have never encouraged him to do anything. Nobody can say that he and I have any kind of friendship, really, other than I believe that all of us have collegiality and that we ought to be friendly with each other.

But he is going to be vindicated. Stay strong. People are going to say ugly things. He may even get threats. But stay strong, because he is on the right side of history.

More importantly, he is on the right side of righteousness. The right side of righteousness, what a great place to be.

Don't let the head convince you that the heart is wrong. The heart speaks to the soul, to your very being. The head speaks to those who would listen to you. Let your heart speak to you.

Madam Speaker, I pray that we, in this House, will do that which the Constitution and the Framers of the Constitution have given us the opportunity to do in a time such as this with a President such as Trump.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

ADDRESSING THE IMMIGRATION CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address what I think is

the most pressing issue in America right now. But prior to addressing it, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

CONGRATULATING SAMARITAN'S PURSE ON NEW MINISTRY CENTER IN NORTH WILKESBORO, NORTH CAROLINA

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Samaritan's Purse, an international Christian relief organization headquartered in Boone, North Carolina, on its expansion in North Wilkesboro.

This inspiring organization has been providing spiritual and physical aid to impoverished victims of war, disease, famine, and natural disaster since 1970.

The new North Wilkesboro Ministry Center will serve as a lifeline to remote missions in developing countries. It will house inventory from World Medical Mission, including lifesaving medical supplies and an emergency field hospital.

This expansion and the wide-reaching vision of Samaritan's Purse would not be possible without the hardworking and dedicated staff behind it. These great humanitarians are an honor to represent, and I know that they are wonderful ambassadors of North Carolina's Fifth District around the world.

CONGRATULATING NORTH WILKES AND WEST WILKES MIDDLE SCHOOLS ON LIGHTHOUSE CERTIFICATION

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize North Wilkes Middle School and West Wilkes Middle School in North Carolina's Fifth District on their recent achievement of Lighthouse certification for implementing the Leader in Me program. Lighthouse certification is the highest recognition awarded by the FranklinCovey institute, and these are the first schools to receive this distinction in our State.

I commend the schools' administration, staff, and students for embracing new paradigms of leadership and undertaking the comprehensive school improvement model put forth by the Leader in Me program. The program aims to provide a holistic education that encompasses leadership, a culture of student empowerment, and academic achievement.

Congratulations to North Wilkes Middle School and West Wilkes Middle School for their demonstrated success. The high-achieving students are evidence of how effectively local leaders in Wilkes County foster positive results with innovation in education.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, prior to addressing the immigration crisis, which is the biggest problem, I think, facing America today, after hearing a rather lengthy speech before mine, I was analyzing the well here and noticing the flag of the United States of America behind me. As I am looking at that flag, I couldn't help but think about the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Pledge of Allegiance begins: "I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands."